

\*E-FILED 05-17-2010\*

NOT FOR CITATION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

MEDIMMUNE, LLC,

No. C08-05590 JF (HRL)

**Plaintiff,**

## **ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

V.

PDL BIOPHARMA, INC.

[Re: Docket No. 486]

**Defendant.**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-9(b), plaintiff MedImmune, LLC (“MedImmune”) moves for reconsideration of this court’s April 1, 2010 order (Docket No. 478) granting a motion for protective order filed by defendant PDL Biopharma, Inc. (“PDL”) as to a subpoena MedImmune served on nonparty Genzyme Corp. (“Genzyme”). Specifically, MedImmune contends that the addition of PDL’s amended counterclaims and the setting of a new case schedule as to those counterclaims presents “new material facts” warranting reconsideration under Civil Local Rule 7-9(b)(2). PDL opposes the motion. This court finds the matter suitable for determination without oral argument, and the May 25, 2010 hearing is vacated. See Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).

Upon consideration of the moving and responding papers, this court grants the motion. Although nothing changes the fact that the Genzyme subpoena was late, this court finds that the balance of equities has shifted in MedImmune's favor. The April 1, 2010 order was based on

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1 the fact that the Genzyme subpoena was late and, under the then-existing schedule, PDL would  
2 be prejudiced. The June 2010 trial has since been vacated. True, there has been no wholesale  
3 reopening of discovery as to issues that have been in the case from the start. Nevertheless,  
4 MedImmune convincingly argues that the discovery in question is important to its prior art  
5 investigation. Moreover, this court is unpersuaded that PDL lacks sufficient time to complete  
6 the follow-up discovery it says it may need to conduct. In sum, after weighing competing  
7 legitimate interests and possible prejudice, this court concludes that MedImmune should be  
8 permitted to proceed with the Genzyme subpoena. The parties are admonished, however, to  
9 proceed promptly so that the Genzyme-related discovery may be accomplished under existing  
10 deadlines set by Judge Fogel.

11 SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: May 17, 2010

13  
14   
HOWARD E. LLOYD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1 5:08-cv-05590-JF Notice electronically mailed to:  
2 Aaron P. Maurer amaurer@wc.com  
3 Aaron Y Huang aaron.huang@weil.com  
4 Dana K Powers dana.powers@weil.com  
5 David Isaac Berl dberl@wc.com  
6 David Isaac Gindler DGindler@Irell.com, dlieberman@irell.com  
7 Gerson Avery Zweifach gzweifach@wc.com  
8 Gregory Hull greg.hull@weil.com, rebecca.kraus@weil.com  
9 Jeffrey E. Faucette jfaucette@tcolaw.com, cdunbar@tcolaw.com, cwoodrich@tcolaw.com,  
mcianfrani@tcolaw.com  
10 Jessamyn Sheli Berniker jberniker@wc.com  
11 Paul B. Gaffney pgaffney@wc.com  
12 Raymond Angelo LaMagna rlamagna@irell.com  
13 Vernon Michael Winters vern.winters@weil.com, nettie.asiasi@weil.com  
14  
15 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not  
registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28